

University of Miami Law School Institutional Repository

University of Miami Law Review

7-1-1961

The Editor's Page

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr>

Recommended Citation

The Editor's Page, 15 U. Miami L. Rev. Iss. 4 (1961)

Available at: <http://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr/vol15/iss4/1>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Miami Law Review by an authorized administrator of Institutional Repository. For more information, please contact library@law.miami.edu.

THE EDITOR'S PAGE

No doubt by this time our readers have noted with some amusement the perennial tardiness in publication of the final issue of any given volume of the *Review*. At this writing, it is fairly safe to say that volume [15] is no exception. In the lengthy period preceding the publication of this issue, we have given considerable thought to the general question of why this and other law reviews find that at least once a year they miss publication deadlines by a wide margin—generally with the concluding issue. We should like to focus herein on one aspect of the problem—the production of quality articles—in the hope of provoking publishable responses from a few of our learned subscribers.

Needless to say, one of the major causes of delinquency in law review publication centers on the production processes of the *Review's* student section. The multiple resetting of deadlines for completion of student work is well known to all who are even slightly familiar with the operation of a student-managed law review. Each board of editors attempts to install procedures that will assure the timely completion of quality work; very few are completely successful. Nevertheless, as slow as progress in this regard may be, each year the situation improves somewhat. It seems reasonable to conclude that with proper supervision by future boards of editors, the student work problem will be kept within reasonable bounds.

Unfortunately, we do not find as much reason for encouragement in looking to the gradual elimination of the problems involved in producing the *Review's* article section.

This *Review*, like many others, finds itself with a more than adequate number of articles in hand to fill its pages each year. However, many of these articles must be rejected because, taken in the context of the then prevailing printing schedule, they are not appropriate for publication. Other articles, though timely and competently written, are rejected because they are in a sense too timely—they deal with current problems which, because of a particular appeal to the lawyer-author, have been thoroughly “written out.” Lastly, some articles do not, in the occasionally ill-formed judgment of the student editors, satisfy minimum standards of quality. Occasionally, of course, the *Review* receives a greater number of excellent articles than it can publish; and on such occasions, though it may rend their avaricious hearts, the editors must return an article simply because the author cannot afford to delay publishing his work for the convenience of the *Review*. However, such surpluses are all too rare, and the primary problem remains the need for quality articles. Were such articles always available, the *Review* would not need to modify projected production schedules or

wait for additional manuscripts in order to publish an otherwise completed issue.

Unlike many other types of legal issues, in this case an adequate statement of the problem does not contain its resolution. The *Review's* officers send out hundreds of letters each year, make innumerable telephone calls, and strive for as much personal contact as is practicable in attempting to obtain good articles for publication. The results of these efforts are encouraging, for each year the *Review* receives from authors throughout the country more articles in which subjects of national interest are discussed. But it is in the area of contributions from [Florida] lawyers and those familiar with the problems of [Florida] practice that the real void has existed. This is notably ironic because this *Review*, like most of the other reviews in the country, has many times been the center of controversy over whether more so-called "bread and butter" articles dealing with the "practical" problems of law should be published. Without attempting to define those ambiguous terms, suffice it to say that rarely do articles discussing such problems reach our desks.

This is not to say that we wish to alter our position as a "national" law review in order to treat primarily "local issues," but rather to point out that if an imbalance in the former regard exists, it has not been of the choosing of the *Review's* editors. Repeated attempts have been made to obtain articles of local interest. Although it is true that some excellent articles of this type have been received and published, they have been few in number. No doubt several factors have resulted in a paucity of articles of this type, but probably the most important has been the demands upon the time of our best-qualified [Florida] attorneys.

It therefore seems not inappropriate for the *Review* to urge the cause of service to the law and to the profession, and to reaffirm the position it has always taken in the past—that although we intend to continue to publish a predominance of articles dealing with subjects of national dimensions, we enthusiastically welcome articles of local interest. Accordingly, the editors of the *Review* always stand ready to assist attorneys who, desiring to expound upon some aspect of [Florida] law, require information about topics in need of article treatment or have questions relating to *Review* procedures.

*reprinted from 44 Minnesota Law Review, No. 6 (1960) (with changes indicated by brackets).